UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/581,380 | 06/01/2006 | Robertus Martinus M. Diks | F7743(V) | 3881 |
| | 7590 04/21/201 ATENT GROUP | EXAMINER | | |
| 800 SYLVAN A | | SMITH, PRESTON | | |
| AG West S. Wi ENGLEWOOD | ng CLIFFS, NJ 07632-31 | 100 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1782 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/21/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentgroupus@unilever.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/581,380 | DIKS ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| PRESTON SMITH | 1782 | |

| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on | the cover sheet with the correspondence address |
|--|--|
| THE REPLY FILED <u>12 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION | ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sar application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 periods: | (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of | the final rejection. |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONL' | Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Y CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thromay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | nd the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee distatutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. ☑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04/12/2010</u> . A brief in complia | ace with 37 CFR 41 37 must be filed within two months of the |
| date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior | to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further considerat | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or | for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspo | onding number of finally rejected claims. |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | |
| 4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See | attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s). | if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will whow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcom showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was | e <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | · |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SI | 3/08) Paper No(s) |
| 13. Other: | |
| prs | /Drew E Becker/ |
| | Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1782 |
| | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues on page 2 that the office has not explained why Example 1 of applicant's specification is insufficient to show unexpected results for the composition according to the invention. Example 1 does not appear to be claimed and is far more detailed than claim 1. The references cited in the previous office action teach the invention of claim 1. Additionally, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a lack of gelation or age thickening) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).